FILED
1-03-14
01:38 PM

APPENDIX 1

Falcon Ridge Substation Project Intex Alternative

APPENDIX I

Falcon Ridge Substation Project Intex Alternative

This page intentionally left blank

ESA Energy

550 Kearny Street
Suite 800
San Francisco, CA 94108
415.896.5900 phone
415.896.0332 fax

www.esassoc.com

memorandum

date May 17, 2013

to John Boccio

from Janna Scott and Al Kostalas

subject Falcon Ridge Substation Project Intex Alternative

Introduction

This memorandum provides additional analysis about proposed alternatives to the Falcon Ridge Substation Project, proposed by Southern California Edison (SCE) and located in the cities of Fontana, Rialto, Rancho Cucamonga, and unincorporated San Bernardino County (the "Project").

The Draft EIR for the Project was circulated for agency and public review in January, 2012. Comments received on the Draft EIR proposed a new alternative that had not been analyzed in the Draft EIR. SCE was invited to provide input on the reasonableness and feasibility of the proposal. The Final EIR, which was published in October, 2012, documented the analysis of potential impacts of the new alternative (called the "Flood Control District ROW Alternative," or "FCD ROW Alternative") on all resource areas, and found the new alternative to be environmentally superior not only to the Project as proposed, but also to the alternative that the Draft EIR had identified as environmentally superior.

After the Final EIR was published and before the Commission considered the Final EIR for certification, SCE provided additional input regarding the feasibility of the FCD ROW Alternative and proposed a variation of it for the Commission's consideration. This memorandum summarizes SCE's additional input on the FCD ROW Alternative, describes the proposed variation (called the "Intex Alternative"), and provides additional environmental analysis. As explained below, the Intex Alternative is environmentally superior to the Project.

Subsequent Inquiry Reveals the FCD ROW Alternative to be Infeasible

SCE has concluded, based on subsequent inquiry, that the FCD ROW Alternative is infeasible for technical reasons. After reviewing their submittal, we agree. As described in Final EIR Section 2.5.2, the FCD ROW Alternative proposed to place a portion of the Etiwanda Subtransmission Source Line within a 30-foot ROW consisting of a 20-foot ROW on San Bernardino County Flood Control District (SBFCD) property and a 10-foot ROW on land within the Westgate Specific Plan area of Fontana that is owned by Intex Properties. That alternative would have the 66 kV subtransmission line continue within the existing 500 kV ROW until it reaches a ROW owned and maintained by the SBFCD for flood control purposes (the "SBFCD ROW"). From there, the

FCD ROW Alternative would continue eastward, parallel to and within the SBFCD ROW to the intersection of San Sevaine Road, where it would reconnect with the Applicant-proposed route before crossing Interstate-210 (I-210) perpendicularly. In so doing, the FCD ROW Alternative would cross the back of the Intex property near the existing flood control channel and freeway rather than along South Highland Avenue in an area that is proposed for business park use as part of the West Gate Specific Plan. The FCD ROW Alternative otherwise would be the same as the Project described in Draft EIR Chapter 2.

SCE contends that construction of the FCD ROW Alternative would not be technically feasible because the area between the SBCFCD access road and the property line fence varies in width between approximately 9 and 14 feet and is subject to a side slope that varies in elevation between approximately 4 and 6 feet. Consequently, increased pole setting depths would be required. Additionally, the SBFCD access road is approximately 20 feet wide and is made of asphalt paving (the north edge of the road is bound by the top of the southerly concrete flood channel wall, and the southerly edge is bound by the top of the slope). The trucks and equipment used to construct and maintain the 66 kV underground and overhead source lines can weigh in excess of 57,000 pounds and have an outrigger spread of 15 to 25 feet. SCE explains that this equipment, with outriggers extended, would damage the asphalt road at the top of the slope. The methods of installing the underground duct structures, bolted-base steel pole foundations, and pole holes for the tangent line poles on the side slope could undermine the SBFCD access road, and this could cause the boom trucks used for line construction to lose footing and roll over. The FCD ROW Alternative as described also would require temporary removal of the flood control fence and extensive ground disturbance because all excavation and construction of underground duct structures, tubular steel pole (TSP) foundations, and pole holes, as well as job site pole deliveries, would need to be done from the Intex property. Once the Intex property is fully developed, any future major maintenance on the 66 kV source line (such as pole replacements) would be nearly impossible due to restricted access and lack of room for equipment. To avoid these technical issues, SCE met with SBFCD and Intex to discuss the feasibility of placing the 66 kV subtransmission line entirely on Intex's property, and now proposes an alternative that does so.

Proposed New Alternative: The Intex Alternative

The Intex Alternative proposed by SCE (and resulting from discussions with the SBFCD and Intex) would have a similar alignment to the FCD ROW Alternative, but the ROW would be located entirely on Intex property, rather than on a combination of Intex and SBFCD property. Thus, the alignment would be positioned approximately 20 feet south of the FCD ROW Alternative, and would not be located within or utilize the SBFCD ROW. SCE would not need to obtain easement rights from the SBFCD. Based on its discussions with Intex and SBFCD, SCE states that both support the Intex Alternative.

This analysis relies on the following sources of information about the Intex Alternative:

- SCE, 2012. E-mail communication from Thomas Diaz, "Falcon Ridge - New Intex Alternative." December 21.
- SCE, 2013a. E-mail communication from Thomas Diaz, "Re: FW: A.10-12-017_Falcon Ridge PTC SCE's Response to Data Request set A10-12-017 Falcon Ridge-ED-013 Q.01 & Q.02." February 28.
- SCE, 2013b. Email communication from Thomas Diaz, "Falcon Ridge – Intex." April 24.

The Intex Alternative would be shorter than the Applicant-proposed route. The total length of the Intex Alternative would be 2,590 feet, compared to 2,900 feet for the corresponding portion of the proposed route.

Under the Intex Alternative, the 66 kV Etiwanda Subtransmission Source Line would not exit the existing 500 kV transmission line ROW at Highland Avenue, as for the Applicant-proposed route, but would continue within the 500 kV ROW for an additional approximately 700 feet, then turn east, exiting the ROW just south of the existing SBFCD ROW. After exiting the transmission line ROW, the Intex Alternative would be constructed within a vacant portion of the Intex property bordering the southern boundary of the SBFCD ROW, adjacent to the chain link fence that separates the Intex and SBFCD properties. The subtransmission source line would be placed underground for approximately 384 feet to maintain clearance with the existing 500 kV transmission line. It then would rise to an overhead position and continue east parallel to the SBFCD ROW for approximately 1,500 feet to San Sevaine Road. The Intex Alternative would rejoin the Applicant-proposed route at San Sevaine Road to cross I-210 to the north.

The Intex Alternative would require two fewer subtransmission line poles than the Applicant-proposed route. The Alternative Route would require two more TSPs and four fewer light weight steel (LWS) poles than the Applicant-proposed route, for a total of 13 new poles compared to the Project's initial proposal to install approximately 15 new poles in this area. Specifications for TSPs and LWS poles are shown in Figure 2-5 of the Draft EIR. Although the specific locations of new subtransmission poles cannot be determined until final engineering occurs, the total number and types of poles can be estimated based on the length and alignment of the route. The Intex Alternative would require one TSP where the subtransmission line turns east and transitions underground beneath the 500 kV transmission line, at the point where it exits the existing 500 kV transmission line ROW and enters Intex property. A second TSP would be located approximately 384 feet east as the line transitions from underground to overhead. A third TSP would be required just south of I-210 in order to span the freeway to the north. The remaining three would be placed as determined needed and appropriate during final engineering. Approximately seven LWS poles would be required for this route: three along the segment extending northeast from South Highland Avenue, and four on the overhead portion extending along the northern boundary of the Intex property to San Sevaine Road.

The Intex Alternative would require less disturbance (temporary and permanent) than the proposed route. As described in Draft EIR Section 2.6.3 (p. 2-12), the estimated land disturbance for construction of new poles is up to 200 feet by 100 feet per TSP and up to 150 feet by 75 feet per LWS pole. However, disturbance would be limited to within the 30-foot-wide ROW; therefore, it is assumed that the smaller dimension for each of these disturbance areas would be 30 feet for the Intex Alternative. This would result in 6,000 square feet of disturbance per TSP and 4,500 square feet per LWS. Areas temporarily disturbed during construction would be restored to within 25 feet of a TSP foundation or 10 feet of a LWS pole, resulting in approximately 1,740 square feet or 0.04 acre of permanent disturbance per TSP[1] and 416 square feet or 0.01 acre of permanent disturbance per LWS pole. Based on these estimates, installation of new poles would result in approximately 13,352 square feet, or 0.3 acres, of permanent ground disturbance. Additionally, approximately 384 feet of this alternative route would be placed in a new underground duct bank. The trench for the duct bank would be approximately 20 inches wide, and a 15-foot laydown and clearance width also would be required, resulting in 5,760 square feet of disturbance. Because this area would be restored after installation, no permanent disturbance would result. Table 1 summarizes this estimated land disturbance.

[1] Because the area of disturbance for a TSP would be limited to the width of the ROW, this is estimated by assuming that permanent disturbance would be within a rectangle of 30 feet in width (the ROW width) by 58 feet in length (8-foot diameter TSP concrete foundation and 25 feet of disturbance in either direction).

TABLE 1
ESTIMATED LAND DISTURBANCE OF INTEX ALTERNATIVE AND APPLICANT-PROPOSED ROUTE

Intex Alternative Feature	Quantity	Disturbed Area Calculation (L x W)	Area Disturbed During Construction (square feet)	Disturbance Accounted for under New Access Road	Adjusted Temporary Disturbance	Area to be Restored (square feet)	Area Permanently Disturbed (square feet)
Install New 66 kV TSP[1]	6	200' x 100'	120,000	(21,600)	98,400	87,960	10,440
Install New 66 kV LWS Pole[1]	7	150' x 75'	78,750	(18,900)	59,850	56,938	2,912
Install New 66 kV Duct Bank	384	linear feet x 15' wide	5,760	N/A	N/A	5,760	0
New Access Road	2,590	linear feet x 18' wide	46,620	N/A	N/A	0	46,620
Total			**251,130 (5.8 acres)**	**(40,500) (0.9 acre)**	**210,630 4.8 acres**	**150658 (3.45 acres)**	**59,972 (1.4 acres)**
Applicant-Proposed Route Total			**5.7 acres**		**5.7 acres**	**4.3 acres**	**1.4 acres**

[1] Includes foundation installation, structure assembly and erection, conductor & OHGW installation. Area to be restored after construction: Portion of ROW within 25 feet of a TSP or 10 feet of a LWS or wood pole to remain cleared of vegetation and would be permanently disturbed (approximately 0.04 acres per TSP and 0.01 acres per LWS).

SOURCES: SCE, 2013a; SCE, 2013b

The total land disturbance would be approximately half that of the corresponding portion of the Project due to its shorter overall length as well as the narrower width of the ROW. However, its total permanent disturbance would be approximately the same because it would require more TSPs and a slightly longer access road, which are the features resulting in the greatest amount of permanent disturbance.

The Alternative Route would require more road construction and maintenance than the Applicant-proposed route. As shown in Table 1, the Intex Alternative would require the construction and maintenance of approximately 2,590 feet of new access roads – the entire length of the alignment. This is slightly longer than the Project's 2,500 feet of new access roads along this portion, because for the Intex Alternative, new access roads would be required within the existing 500 kV ROW as well as through the Intex property before reaching San Sevaine Road. The new access road would be substantially similar to other proposed access roads along the subtransmission corridor. The road would have a minimum drivable width of 14 feet with 2 feet of shoulder on each side. The gradient would be leveled so that any sustained grade does not exceed 14 percent.

The Intex Alternative would require new easement rights to be obtained. New easement rights would be required to construct the Intex Alternative that would not be required for the Applicant-proposed route. The property owner of that portion of the route (Intex) has offered to grant SCE a 30-foot easement to facilitate the construction and operation of an alternative 66 kV subtransmission line alignment. Intex's proposed easement would parallel the SBFCD ROW from the existing SCE transmission ROW until the terminus of the SBFCD ROW, where it curves slightly to the north and proceeds along the property boundary to San Sevaine Road. The Intex Alternative would not require the Applicant to obtain easement rights from SBFCD.

The Intex Alternative would result in somewhat reduced environmental impacts relative to the Project. Based on discussions with SBFCD and Caltrans, and Intex's offer to grant SCE an easement for purposes of developing an alternative to the Applicant-proposed route, development of the Intex Alternative also could be feasible.

Accordingly, the CPUC has evaluated the potential direct, indirect, and cumulative effects of the Intex Alternative on a resource-by-resource basis and has documented its conclusions below. For the same reasons summarized in Final EIR Section 2.5.2(D) for the FCD ROW Alternative, CEQA does not require circulation of the Intex Alternative for separate agency and public review.

Analysis of Potential Impacts Created by the FCD ROW Alternative

Aesthetics

As described above, the Intex Alternative alignment would be the same as the Project described in Draft EIR Chapter 2, with the exception of the portion of the Etiwanda Subtransmission Source Line Route in the vicinity of South Highland Avenue and San Sevaine Road. Therefore, impacts from the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Intex Alternative would be the same as the Project; adverse visual impacts to scenic vistas would be less than significant or less than significant with mitigation for Baseline, Beech, Cherry, Citrus, Etiwanda, Sierra, and Wilson avenues; Foothill Boulevard; and I-15. The Intex Alternative would not be located in the vicinity of any state-designated or eligible scenic highways in the study area (no impact), would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings (less than significant), nor would this Alternative introduce new sources of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area (less than significant).

Compared to the Project, the Intex Alternative would result in reduced impacts to viewers on South Highland Avenue, a roadway with moderate to high visual sensitivity that provides views of scenic vistas to the north. While the Project would result in significant and unavoidable impacts to viewers on South Highland Avenue, this Alternative would not be located along South Highland Avenue: instead, it would cross South Highland Avenue to extend northeast within the existing 500 kV ROW until just south of the SBFCD ROW. As described above, from there, the Intex Alternative would continue eastward to the intersection of San Sevaine Road, where it would reconnect with the Applicant-proposed route before crossing I-210. In so doing, the Intex Alternative would be located on property near the existing flood control channel and freeway rather than along South Highland Avenue in an area that is proposed for business park use. To viewers on South Highland Avenue, the Intex Alternative would appear to the north, against a backdrop of open space and I-210 in the foreground, and distant mountains in the background. Motorists would pass under the subtransmission line as it crossed the roadway in existing SCE ROW. The addition of new subtransmission poles and conductor would cause a perceptible increase in structure prominence and industrial character within the landscape. However, motorists already traverse SCE ROW east of the Cherry Avenue, and for the portion of the alternative that parallels South Highland Avenue, the increased distance between the viewer and the subtransmission line would be enough that these components would not demand attention, and would be co-dominant with other features in the viewshed including existing utility infrastructure and mountains in the background. Visual contrast would be low to moderate. The new features would not block views of the San Bernardino and San Gabriel Mountains in the background to the north, and the overall visual change would be low to moderate. Per Draft EIR Table 4.1-2, given South Highland Avenue's moderate to high visual sensitivity, the resulting visual impact would be adverse but not significant.

Compared to the Project, the Intex Alternative would result in minor increased impacts to viewers on I-210, a roadway with high visual sensitivity that provides views of scenic vistas to the north; the portion of the Alternative in the Intex property would be located closer to I-210 than the commensurate portion of the Project, by approximately 0.1 mile. However, the Alternative alignment would be located to the south of I-210, and therefore would not impact scenic views of the San Bernardino and San Gabriel Mountains to the north. This

alternative would traverse I-210 at the same location as the Project. For viewers looking north towards the mountains (i.e., the scenic views), the visual change would be experienced only very briefly, while approaching and crossing under the subtransmission source line. Like the Project, under this Alternative, actual impacts at this KOP would be adverse but less than significant.

Agriculture and Forestry Resources

The Intex Route would be located on land that is designated as Unique Farmland, and would result in some permanent conversion of Unique Farmland to nonagricultural use. However, the Intex Alternative would cause less of an impact on Unique Farmland than the Applicant-proposed route because only 4,453 feet of source line would be located on land bearing this designation as compared to 4,785 feet of source line for the proposed Project. Similar to the Project and the FCD ROW Alternative, this farmland conversion previously was analyzed in the City of Fontana General Plan Update EIR, which concluded that the conversion was a significant and unavoidable impact, and so required the adoption of a Statement of Overriding Considerations for the loss of agricultural land. The Intex Alternative alignment is not zoned for agricultural use, nor is it subject to a Williamson Act contract. It is not located on land zoned as forest land or timberland. Therefore, construction, operation, and maintenance of the Intex Alternative would result in the same impact conclusions as the Project (see Draft EIR Section 4.2, Agriculture and Forestry Resources) for significance criteria a) through e), but would have a decreased impact related to the conversion of Unique Farmland to non-agricultural use.

Air Quality

Construction of the Intex Alternative would not require additional construction equipment beyond that already included in the air quality analysis (see Draft EIR Appendix C); consequently, there would be no new or different criteria air pollutants or toxic air contaminants emitted during the construction of the Intex Alternative than already were analyzed in the Draft EIR. Although construction of the Intex Alternative would result in more trenching for underground duct bank and a slightly longer access road, it would result in a somewhat shorter subtransmission source line with fewer new poles and would require slightly more total ground disturbance compared to the Applicant-proposed route. Therefore, the Intex Alternative would result in slightly lower annual emissions compared to the Applicant-proposed route. However, on a daily basis the construction emissions associated with the Intex Alternative would be expected to be similar to those identified in Draft EIR Table 4.3-6 for the Project. Therefore, although the impact conclusions relating to regional air quality associated with NO_x and PM10 would remain the same as the Project (i.e., temporarily significant and unavoidable), implementation of the Intex Alternative would cause a slightly reduced impact relative to the Project.

Implementation of the Intex Alternative would increase the distance from the route to the closest sensitive receptors (i.e., the condominium complex at the corner of South Highland Avenue and San Sevaine Road) by approximately 500 feet compared to the Applicant-proposed route. This would result in additional dilution of construction equipment diesel exhaust emissions at the condominium complex. Therefore, the air quality and odor-related impacts on sensitive receptors under the Intex Alternative would be slightly reduced compared to the Project, although the impact conclusions would be the same (i.e., less than significant).

Finally, operations associated with the Intex Alternative would not result in the release of any air emissions, and any vehicle trips required for periodic maintenance would be indistinguishable from the infrequent trips that would be required for maintenance of the Applicant-proposed route. Therefore, operations and maintenance-

related impacts associated with the Intex Alternative would be the same as the Project's impacts in these respects (i.e., less than significant).

Biological Resources

The Intex Alternative would traverse disturbed habitat that is similar to the comparable portions of the Applicant-proposed route. The Intex Alternative is within the ruderal (disturbed) fringe surrounding vineyard lands, and appears to support several small, remnant stands of undisturbed grassland habitat, though no evidence of Riversidean sage scrub, a CDFW-sensitive vegetation community, is noted in the alignment. Habitat types in the alignment appear to include ruderal habitat, disturbed annual grassland, vineyard, and disturbed habitat. It is noteworthy that the defunct vineyard located adjacent to the Intex Alternative is gradually being recolonized by non-native grasses and native herbaceous species.

CEQA Guidelines biological resource-related significance criterion a) relates to potential impacts to species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the CDFW or USFWS. Portions of the Intex Alternative could potentially support special-status plants or wildlife species; however, given the level of disturbance, the overall likelihood is considered low. Focused, USFWS protocol-level biological surveys were performed for the Applicant-proposed route and comparable survey data is not available for the Intex Alternative; therefore, this estimate of potential biological resources that may be encountered on the Intex Alternative would require separate surveys to confirm impact conclusions. The route is within the occupied range of the coast horned lizard, coast patch-nosed snake, burrowing owl, northwestern San Diego pocket mouse, San Diego black-tailed jackrabbit, San Diego desert woodrat, southern grasshopper mouse, American badger, and Los Angeles pocket mouse. Thus, these species would be presumed present similar to the comparable portion of the Applicant-proposed route. Therefore, Mitigation Measure 4.4-2 identified for the Applicant-proposed route also would be required for the Intex Alternative. In the absence of focused surveys of the Intex Alternative to demonstrate absence of burrowing owl (a California species of special concern) and San Bernardino kangaroo rat (federally listed endangered), it is possible that these species could occur within the alignment. The Applicant-proposed route is not within designated critical habitat for San Bernardino kangaroo rat, which occurs north of I-210. Plummer's mariposa lily and Parry's spineflower were identified in portions of the Intex Alternative (though not near the modified alignment) and in the absence of focused surveys, there is a low likelihood that these or other special-status plant species may occur in the Intex Alternative.

Because protocol-level surveys demonstrated the absence of San Bernardino kangaroo rat in the Applicant-proposed route, additional kangaroo rat surveys were not required to mitigate project impacts. Additional surveys would be required for the Intex Alternative to identify the potential presence or absence of San Bernardino kangaroo rat and special-status plants in the alignment (see Mitigation Measure Intex Alternative-BIO-1 and BIO-2, respectively, below). If the San Bernardino kangaroo rat were identified during surveys, additional protective measures would be required, such as avoiding occupied habitat by siting towers to avoid occupied habitat or using an alternate route such as the Applicant-proposed route. Due to the high degree of existing ground disturbance of habitat within the Intex Alternative and surrounding intensive land uses (I-210 to the north and vineyards to the south), the likelihood of encountering San Bernardino kangaroo rat and/or special-status plants in the alignment is considered low.

Similar to the Applicant-proposed route, the Intex Alternative would have comparable potential impacts to common or protected nesting migratory birds, and similar hazards to raptors as a result of electrocution or

collision. Therefore, APMs identified for the Applicant-proposed route, and Mitigation Measure 4.4-4 identified for the Applicant-proposed route would also be required for the Intex Alternative.

Mitigation Measure Intex Alternative-BIO-1: A habitat assessment for San Bernardino kangaroo rat shall be conducted by a qualified biologist within the Intex Alternative if this route is approved. If no potential occupied habitat is found during this assessment, then no further action would be necessary. If potential or occupied habitat is identified, USFWS protocol-level trapping surveys shall be performed. Based on survey findings, two potential outcomes are possible:

- If San Bernardino kangaroo rats are not identified during trapping, no impact would occur and no further action would be required.

- If San Bernardino kangaroo rats are detected during surveys, an alternate alignment could be selected or the route altered to completely avoid all potential or occupied habitat for this species. If complete avoidance is not feasible, minimization measures shall be implemented to reduce potential project impacts within occupied habitat to the maximum extent feasible. Such measures could include minimizing that portion of the project footprint that could encroach on an occupied habitat area, surveying and establishing exclusionary perimeter fencing around such areas, and staging materials and work so as not to encroach into them. The presence of a Biological Monitor during Project construction shall be required to further ensure that any potential impacts to special-status wildlife species are avoided and minimized. For those impacts that cannot feasibly be avoided or further minimized, SCE shall purchase mitigation credits from the Cajon Creek Conservation Bank, which is a CDFW-approved conservation and mitigation bank with the capacity to accommodate the project's mitigation requirements.

Significance after Mitigation: Less than Significant.

Mitigation Measure Intex Alternative-BIO-2: If the Intex Alternative is selected, portions of the proposed alignment that have not been surveyed to determine the potential presence or absence of special-status plants shall be surveyed following the most recent CDFG rare plant survey protocol (CDFG, 2009). Following surveys, two potential outcomes are possible:

- If special-status plants are not identified during focused surveys, impacts would not be anticipated and no further action would be required.

- If special-status plants are identified during surveys, the implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.4-1 would reduce potential impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Significance after Mitigation: Less than Significant.

CEQA Guidelines biological resource-related significance criteria b) and c) relate to potential impacts to riparian habitat, sensitive natural communities, or federally protected wetlands. The Intex Alternative would not impact wetlands, riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community, as they do not occur in the alignment.

CEQA Guidelines biological resource-related significance criterion d) relates to movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or use of native wildlife nursery sites. The Intex Alternative would not interfere with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites. No such sites occur in the local vicinity of the Intex Alternative, which abuts a freeway and degraded agricultural lands.

CEQA Guidelines biological resource-related significance criterion e) relates to whether a proposed project or alternative would conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance. The Intex Alternative would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance, or with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Communities Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.

Following the implementation of protective measures, the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Intex Alternative is expected to result in the same impact conclusions as the Project (see Draft EIR Section 4.4, *Biological Resources*) for significance criteria a) through e). The Intex Alternative traverses disturbed habitat similar to that which occurs on the proposed route and the likelihood of encountering sensitive resources in this alignment, which has not been fully studied for biological resources, is estimated to be low.

Cultural Resources

The Intex Alternative would result in the construction of approximately 300 fewer feet of subtransmission line and approximately 90 more feet of new access road, but overall it would not substantially change the size, location or type of facilities to be constructed. Therefore, the facts, analysis and significance conclusions presented for the Applicant-proposed route generally hold true for the Intex Alternative, with one exception. Focused cultural resources surveys were performed for the Applicant-proposed route, but comparable survey data is not available for all of the Intex Alternative. Because the Intex Alternative, where it diverges from the Applicant-proposed route, has not been subject to cultural resources survey, the presence or absence of cultural resources within this portion of the Intex Alternative is unknown, and therefore it is possible that there are previously undocumented cultural resources within these unsurveyed areas. However, because Mitigation Measure Alternative 1-CUL-1 would require additional archaeological survey of unsurveyed areas, the potential cultural resource-related impact of the Intex Alternative would be the same as the Project (i.e., less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated).

With respect to paleontological resources, the Intex Alternative would result in similar impacts to paleontological resources as the Project because the two alignments are underlain by the same geologic units.

Potential impacts to cultural resources under this alternative would be similar to the Applicant-proposed route. Mitigation Measures 4.5-1, 4.5-2, 4.5-3, and Alternative 1-CUL-1 also would be required for the Intex Alternative. The significance conclusions in Draft EIR Section 4.5, *Cultural Resources*, with regard to significance criteria a) through d) would be the same for the Intex Alternative as for the Project.

Energy Conservation

Construction of the Intex Alternative would result in incrementally less energy consumption for construction equipment and construction-related transportation compared to the Applicant-proposed route because of the shorter route resulting in less land disturbance and subtransmission line pole installation. However, the approximately 45 feet more of trenching for the underground portion would result in an incremental increase in energy consumption. As with the Project, the Intex Alternative would not interrupt existing local SCE service and construction-related energy demands are not expected to have a significant adverse effect on energy resources. Like the Project, the Intex Alternative would contribute to meeting projected local peak demand electricity needs and would have no impact on local or regional energy supplies or capacity, nor would it impact electricity generation facilities' ability to provide and maintain existing levels of service during peak and base period

demands. Therefore, the impact conclusions related to the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Intex Alternative would be the same as for the Project in Draft EIR Section 4.6, *Energy Conservation*, with regard to criteria a) through f).

Geology, Soils, and Seismicity

The Intex Alternative would not substantially change the size or type of facilities to be constructed. The Intex Alternative would be slightly shorter, require slightly more access road construction and maintenance, and result in less overall land disturbance than the Project. Because the Intex Alternative, like the Applicant-proposed route, would cross mostly flat terrain underlain by similar earth materials, it would result in similar potential impacts with respect to seismic ground shaking and/or seismic-related ground failure, soil erosion, unstable geologic units or soils, and expansive soils. While SCE has not yet prepared a geotechnical investigation of the subtransmission source line route, associated facilities, or telecommunications system, one would be prepared if necessary as part of pre-construction activities. Likewise, review of all geotechnical reports and their incorporation into Project plans would occur prior to issuance of a grading or building permit by the agency with jurisdiction over the construction activity. Design recommendations from existing geotechnical reports also would be relevant and applied to the design of the Intex Alternative. For example, for underground sections of the subtransmission source line (e.g., the 384-foot section of the Intex Alternative that would be underground), the trench would be backfilled with a slurry mix that is non-expansive. Therefore, the significance conclusions with respect to each of the criteria in Draft EIR Section 4.7, *Geology, Soils, and Seismicity*, would be the same for the Intex Alternative as they are for the Project.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Implementation of the Intex Alternative would result in slightly lower construction emissions compared to the Applicant-proposed route primarily because construction of the Intex Alternative would require a total construction disturbance area that would be less than half of that required for the Applicant-proposed route even though the alternative would require a slightly longer access road. In addition, GHG emissions generated during operation and maintenance of the Intex Alternative would be the same as those described for the Project. Therefore, the Intex Alternative would cause incrementally (but inconsequentially) fewer GHG emissions than the Project and the significance conclusions reached in Draft EIR Section 4.8, *Greenhouse Gas Emissions*, for the Project would be the same for the Intex Alternative.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The Intex Alternative is within the regulatory agency database search area reviewed for identification of hazardous materials sites in the vicinity of the Project. No hazardous materials sites are identified in this area; therefore, the impact determinations related to location on a hazardous materials site and the potential to encounter hazardous materials in soil or groundwater during Project construction would be the same for the Intex Alternative as they would be for the Project. Further, the location of the Intex Alternative would not change the impact determinations related to hazards in proximity to schools or airports, wildland fires, and potential to interfere with an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan. Although the total length of the Intex Alternative would be shorter, the Intex Alternative would not substantially lessen the kinds and amounts of hazardous materials associated with Project construction or operation and impact conclusions for the Intex Alternative would be the same as the Project pertaining to the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials or hazards to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident

conditions. In summary, the Intex Alternative would not change the impact conclusions in Section 4.9, *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*, related to significance criteria a) through h).

Hydrology and Water Quality

The Intex Alternative would not substantially change the size or type of facilities to be constructed. The Intex Alternative would be slightly shorter and result in less overall land disturbance. Because the Intex Alternative, like the Applicant-proposed route, would cross mostly flat terrain, and differ from the Applicant-proposed route only over a relatively short section, it would result in similar potential impacts with respect to existing water quality standards and the potential for increasing erosion and/or flooding. Similar to the Applicant-proposed route, the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Intex Alternative would generally pose a low threat to water quality due to the level terrain, high rate of soil infiltration, and the regulatory controls that would apply. The mitigation measures that would be required to avoid or reduce the significance of Project impacts also would be required for Intex Alternative (e.g., preparation and implementation of a SWPPP, a WQMP, and, if required, coverage under a water quality certification, and/or WDR). These mitigation measures would be sufficient to reduce potential water quality impacts to a less-thau-significant level. Therefore, there would be no change to the conclusions in Draft EIR Section 4.10, *Hydrology and Water Quality*, with regard to hydrology and water quality.

Land Use and Planning

The Intex Alternative would be located within the Project Area analyzed in the Draft EIR; it would not change the land uses proposed by the Project; physically divide a community; be located within a land use or zoning designation not analyzed in Draft EIR Section 4.11; or conflict with any with applicable land use plans, policies, or regulations. Although the Intex Alternative would be located on land within the as-yet undeveloped West Gate Specific Plan area, this alternative would relocate the subtransmission line and access road from South Highland Avenue to the back of the property paralleling the fence between the Intex Property and the SBFCD ROW, thereby reducing any potential access restrictions that could occur once this area is developed. The Intex Alternative also would require an adjustment in the location of the proposed Intex easement. The Intex Alternative would result in the same impact conclusions as the Project with respect to the significance criteria considered in Draft EIR Section 4.11, *Land Use and Planning*.

Mineral Resources

The Intex Alternative would not substantially change the size or type of facilities to be constructed. While portions of the Project area do intersect some aggregate resource sectors, the Intex Alternative alignment would not be within an area currently available for extraction of mineral resources. It would be within and bounded to the south by the as-yet undeveloped West Gate Specific Plan area, and bounded by a flood control channel to the north. Therefore, the impact significance conclusions would be the same for the Intex Alternative as they are for the Project in Draft EIR Section 4.12, *Mineral Resources*.

Noise

Implementation of the Intex Alternative would increase the distance from the route to the closest sensitive receptors (i.e., the condominium complex at the corner of South Highland Avenue and San Sevaine Road) by approximately 500 feet compared to the Applicant-proposed route. This would result in additional attenuation of construction equipment and corona discharge noise levels at the condominium complex. Therefore, although the significance conclusion regarding noise and vibration impacts on those sensitive receptors would be the same as for the Project (i.e., less than significant) the Intex Alternative would cause incrementally less noise than the

Project. Mitigation Measure 4.13-5 would apply to the Intex Alternative just as it would to the Project in the event that nighttime construction activities would occur near San Sevaine Road south of I-210 because that area would continue to be within 1,000 feet of the condominium complex.

The segment of the Etiwanda Subtransmission Source Line Route that would be within the City of Rancho Cucamonga is shared by the Intex Alternative and the Applicant-proposed route; therefore, the Draft EIR significant and unavoidable Impact 4.13-1 conclusion associated with construction activities violating City of Rancho Cucamonga exterior noise standards would be the same. Similarly, the Alder Subtransmission Source Line Route would be implemented under both the Intex Alternative and the Applicant-proposed route; therefore, Impact 4.13-6 associated with Rialto Municipal Airport noise would be the same.

In summary, the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Intex Alternative would have an incrementally smaller impact than the Project; however, since the reductions would be so slight, the impact conclusions would be the same for the Intex Alternative as those reached for the Project in Draft EIR Section 4.13, *Noise*.

Population and Housing

Although total amount of construction associated with the Intex Alternative would be less than the Applicant-proposed route due to the shorter length, the overall number of workers required for construction of the entire Project is not expected to change. The Intex Alternative would not propose new homes or businesses nor displace any housing or people. Operation of the Intex Alternative would not indirectly induce substantial population growth or encourage new development as the Project is designed to meet forecasted demand projections for electrical service. Therefore, construction, operation, and maintenance of the Intex Alternative would have the same population and housing-related effects as the Project (see Draft EIR Section 4.14, *Population and Housing*).

Public Services

Construction of the Intex Alternative would not change the number of workers required for Project construction discussed in the Draft EIR, nor would it cause an increased demand or need for fire protection, police protection, school facilities, parks, or other public facilities. Therefore, it would not result in the construction of new or expanded existing government facilities for public services. Consequently, the impacts of the Intex Alternative would be the same as the conclusions reached for the Project in Draft EIR Section 4.15, *Public Services*.

Recreation

The Intex Alternative does not propose any recreational facilities, nor would it change the number of workers required for Project construction described in the Draft EIR. Therefore, it would not cause physical deterioration of existing facilities, or indirectly require construction or expansion of recreational facilities. Implementation of the Intex Alternative would cause the same impacts and result in the same impact significance conclusions as were reached for the Project in Draft EIR Section 4.16, *Recreation*.

Transportation and Traffic

The Intex Alternative would alter and shorten the Applicant-proposed route by approximately 310 feet and would require the construction and maintenance of approximately 90 feet more of new access road than the Applicant-proposed route. The Intex Alternative would not substantially change the size or type of facilities to be constructed and would not require a workforce or equipment above and beyond what is described in the Draft EIR Chapter 2, *Project Description*, and analyzed in Section 4.17, *Transportation and Traffic*. Because the Intex

Alternative would generate either similar or slightly lower levels of construction traffic along similar roadways as the Applicant-proposed route, potential impacts to transportation and traffic under this alternative would be substantially similar to the Applicant-proposed route. Therefore, Mitigation Measures 4.17-1 and 4.17-2 identified for the Applicant-proposed route also would be required for this alternative. In addition, traffic related to operation and maintenance of the Intex Alternative would be the same as for the Applicant-proposed route because the same number of staff and maintenance activities would be required, so impacts would be the same. Therefore, the impact significance conclusions for the Intex Alternative would be the same as those reached for the Project in Draft EIR Section 4.17, *Transportation and Traffic*.

Utilities and Service Systems

The Intex Alternative would result in substantially similar water consumption and wastewater and solid waste generation although its subtransmission source line route would be slightly shorter. The slight decrease in length would not substantially change wastewater treatment needs, wastewater treatment facility capacity, water supply needs, or solid waste disposal needs relative to the Project. Consequently, the impact significance conclusions would be the same as those reached for the Project in Draft EIR Section 4.18, *Utilities and Service Systems*.

Comparison of the Intex Alternative to the FCD ROW Alternative

Although the FCD ROW Alternative has been determined to be infeasible for the technical reasons described above, because the FCD ROW Alternative was identified in the Draft EIR as the environmentally superior alternative, a comparison of it and the newly-proposed Intex Alternative is provided for informational purposes. SCE estimates that the overhead subtransmission source line under the Intex Alternative would be approximately 31 feet longer than the FCD ROW Alternative, the underground ROW would be approximately the same length, and the access road would be approximately 1,411 feet longer. The Intex Alternative also would require three more TSPs and three fewer LWS poles than the FCD ROW Alternative. (SCE, 2013a)

As described in this memorandum for the Intex Alternative and in Final EIR Section 2.5.2 for the FCD Alternative, the significance conclusions of the two alternatives would be the same even if some of the intensity of individual effects would vary slightly. The Intex Alternative would result in the disturbance and permanent conversion of more Unique Farmland than the FCD ROW Alternative because it would be constructed nearly all within an easement on land designated as Unique Farmland, rather than within the FCD ROW, which is not designated as Unique Farmland. However, as described above under Agriculture and Forestry Resources, the impact of this conversion already has been analyzed by the City of Fontana General Plan EIR. The Intex Alternative would result in incrementally greater air pollutant and GHG emissions during construction due to its longer overall length and longer access road. However, daily emissions would likely be similar. Similarly, the Intex Alternative would use incrementally more energy during construction.

The Intex Alternative is Environmentally Superior to the Project

As summarized in Draft EIR Section ES.7 (p. ES-9) and analyzed throughout Draft EIR Chapter 4 (p. 4-1 et seq.), the proposed Project would cause no adverse impact related to Agriculture and Forest Resources and Public Services and a less-than-significant impact to the following resources: Energy Conservation, Geology and Soils, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Hydrology and Water Quality, Land Use and Planning, Mineral Resources, Population and Housing, and Utilities and Service Systems. With the implementation of identified mitigation measures, the Project also would cause a less-than-significant impact to: Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Recreation, and Transportation and Traffic. By contrast, it was

determined that development of the Project would cause significant and unavoidable impacts to three resource areas: Aesthetics, Air Quality, and Noise.

As described above, analysis of the environmental effects of the Intex Alternative generally would result in the same impact conclusions as the Project with one exception: The Project's significant and unavoidable Aesthetics impact relative to South Highland Avenue would be reduced by the Intex Alternative to a less than significant level. The Intex Alternative would result in a less than significant (rather than significant unavoidable) impact to viewers on South Highland Avenue, which provides views of scenic vistas to the north, because it would remove the subtransmission line route from South Highland Avenue and, instead, would locate it slightly further north, and thereby would increase the distance between viewers and the subtransmission line. The Intex Alternative would not block views of the San Bernardino and San Gabriel Mountains in the background to the north. In addition, the Intex Alternative would cause incrementally reduced impacts to noise and air quality relative to the Project because the Intex Alternative would be located farther away from sensitive receptors than the Project. For these reasons, the Intex Alternative is environmentally superior to the Project.

(END OF APPENDIX 1)

APPENDIX 2

Mitigation Monitoring, Reporting, and Compliance Program

STATE OF CALIFORNIA Edmund G. Brown Jr., Governor

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298

MITIGATION MONITORING, REPORTING, AND COMPLIANCE PROGRAM

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON'S
FALCON RIDGE SUBSTATION PROJECT
(APPLICATION NO. A.10-12-017)

INTRODUCTION

This document describes the mitigation monitoring, reporting, and compliance program (MMRCP) for ensuring the effective implementation of the mitigation measures required for the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC, or Commission) approval of the Southern California Edison's (SCE) application to construct, operate, and maintain the Project. All mitigation measures are presented in Table H-1 provided at the end of this MMRCP.

If the Project is approved, this MMRCP would serve as a self-contained general reference for the Mitigation Monitoring, Reporting, and Compliance Program adopted by the Commission for the Project. If and when the Project is approved by the Commission, the CPUC will compile the Final MMRCP based on this Appendix H to the Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and any revisions to it that the CPUC may make during its EIR certification and permit approval processes.

California Public Utilities Commission – MMRCP Authority

The California Public Utilities Code in numerous places confers authority upon the CPUC to regulate the terms of service and the safety, practices, and equipment of utilities subject to its jurisdiction. It is the standard practice of the CPUC, pursuant to its statutory responsibility to protect the environment, to require that mitigation measures stipulated as conditions of approval be implemented properly, monitored, and reported on. In 1989, this requirement was codified statewide as §21081.6 of the Public Resources Code. Section 21081.6 requires a public agency to adopt a MMRCP when it approves a project that is subject to preparation of an EIR and where the EIR for the project identifies potentially significant environmental effects. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines §15097 was added in 1999 to further clarify agency requirements for mitigation monitoring and reporting.

The purpose of a MMRCP is to ensure that measures adopted to mitigate or avoid significant impacts of a project are implemented. The CPUC views the MMRCP as a working guide to facilitate not only the implementation of mitigation measures by the project proponent, but also the monitoring, compliance, and reporting activities of the CPUC and any monitors it may designate.

The Commission will address its responsibility under Public Resources Code §21081.6 when it takes action on SCE's applications. If the Commission approves the applications, it will also adopt a MMRCP that includes the mitigation measures ultimately made a condition of approval by the Commission.

Because the CPUC must decide whether or not to approve the SCE application and because the application may cause either direct or reasonably foreseeable indirect effects on the environment, CEQA requires the CPUC to consider the potential environmental impacts that could occur as the result of its decisions and to consider mitigation for any identified significant environmental impacts.

If the CPUC approves SCE's application for authority to construct and operate the substation, subtransmission source lines, distribution getaways, and telecommunications facilities, SCE would be responsible for implementation of any mitigation measures governing both construction and future operation of the Project. Though other state and local agencies would have permit and approval authority over construction of the transmission line, the CPUC would continue to act as the lead agency for monitoring compliance with all mitigation measures required by this EIR. All approvals and permits obtained by SCE would be submitted to the CPUC for mitigation compliance prior to commencing the activity for which the permits and approvals were obtained.

In accordance with CEQA, the CPUC reviewed the impacts that would result from approval of the application. The activities considered include the construction and operation of the new Falcon Ridge Substation, subtransmission source line segments, distribution getaways, and telecommunications facilities. The CPUC review concluded that Project implementation could result in significant unmitigable impacts on Aesthetics, Air Quality, and Noise. All other potential impacts could be mitigated to less-than-significant levels. SCE has agreed to incorporate all the proposed mitigation measures into the Project. The CPUC has included the stipulated mitigation measures as conditions of approval of the applications and has circulated a Draft EIR.

The attached EIR presents and analyzes potential environmental impacts that would result from construction, operation, and maintenance of the Project, and proposes mitigation measures as appropriate. Based on the EIR, approval of the application would have no impact or less-than-significant impacts in the following areas:

- Agriculture and Forestry Resources
- Energy Conservation
- Geology and Soils
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Land Use and Planning
- Mineral Resources
- Population and Housing
- Public Services
- Utilities and Service Systems

The EIR indicates that approval of the application would result in potentially significant impacts in the areas of:

- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Recreation
- Transportation and Traffic

The EIR indicates that approval of the application would result in significant unmitigable impacts in the in the areas of:

- Aesthetics
- Air Quality
- Noise

Roles and Responsibilities

As the lead agency under CEQA, the CPUC is required to monitor this project to ensure that the required mitigation measures and any Applicant Proposed Measures (APMs) are implemented. The CPUC will be responsible for ensuring full compliance with the provisions of this MMRCP and has primary responsibility for implementation of the monitoring program. The purpose of the monitoring program is to document that the mitigation measures required by the CPUC are implemented and that mitigated environmental impacts are reduced to the level identified in the Program. The CPUC has the authority to halt any activity associated with the Project if the activity is determined to be a deviation from the approved project or the adopted mitigation measures.

The CPUC may delegate duties and responsibilities for monitoring to other mitigation monitors or consultants as deemed necessary. The CPUC will ensure that the person(s) delegated any duties or responsibilities are qualified to monitor compliance.

The CPUC, along with its mitigation monitor, will ensure that any variance process, which will be designed specifically for the Project, or deviation from the procedures identified under the monitoring program, is consistent with CEQA requirements; no Project variance will be approved by the CPUC if it creates new significant environmental impacts. As defined in this MMRCP, a variance should be strictly limited to minor Project changes that will not trigger other permit requirements, that does not increase the severity of an impact or create a new impact, and that clearly and strictly complies with the intent of the mitigation measure. A proposed Project change that has the potential for creating significant environmental effects will be evaluated to determine whether supplemental CEQA review is required. Any proposed deviation from the approved Project and adopted mitigation measures, including correction of such deviation, shall be reported immediately to the CPUC and the mitigation monitor assigned to the construction for their review and approval. In some cases, a variance may also require approval by a CEQA responsible agency.

Enforcement and Responsibility

The CPUC is responsible for enforcing the procedures for monitoring through the environmental monitor. The environmental monitor shall note problems with monitoring, notify appropriate agencies or individuals about any problems, and report the problems to the CPUC. The CPUC has the authority to halt any construction, operation, or maintenance activity associated with the Project if the activity is determined to be a deviation from the approved Project or adopted mitigation measures. The CPUC may assign its authority to their environmental monitor.

Mitigation Compliance Responsibility

SCE is responsible for successfully implementing all the adopted mitigation measures in this MMRCP. The MMRCP contains criteria that define whether mitigation is successful. Standards for successful mitigation also are implicit in many mitigation measures that include such requirements as obtaining permits or avoiding a specific impact entirely. Additional mitigation success thresholds will be established by applicable agencies with jurisdiction through the permit process and through the review and approval of specific plans for the implementation of mitigation measures.

SCE shall inform the CPUC and its mitigation monitor in writing of any mitigation measures that are not or cannot be successfully implemented. The CPUC in coordination with its mitigation monitor will assess whether alternative mitigation is appropriate and specify to SCE the subsequent actions required.

Dispute Resolution Process

This MMRCP is expected to reduce or eliminate many of the potential disputes concerning the implementation of the adopted measures. However, in the event that a dispute occurs, the following procedure will be observed:

- **Step 1.** Disputes and complaints (including those of the public) should be directed first to the CPUC's designated Project Manager for resolution. The Project Manager will attempt to resolve the dispute.

- **Step 2.** Should this informal process fail, the CPUC Project Manager may initiate enforcement or compliance action to address deviations from the Project or adopted Mitigation Monitoring Program.

- **Step 3.** If a dispute or complaint regarding the implementation or evaluation of the MMRCP or the mitigation measures cannot be resolved informally or through enforcement or compliance action by the CPUC, any affected participant in the dispute or complaint may file a written "notice of dispute" with the CPUC's Executive Director. This notice should be filed in order to resolve the dispute in a timely manner, with copies concurrently served on other affected participants. Within 10 days of receipt, the Executive Director or designee(s) shall meet or confer with the filer and other affected participants for purposes of resolving the dispute. The Executive Director shall issue an Executive Resolution describing his/her decision, and serve it on the filer and other affected participants.

- **Step 4.** If one or more of the affected parties is not satisfied with the decision as described in the Resolution, such party(ies) may appeal it to the Commission via a procedure to be specified by the Commission.

Parties may also seek review by the Commission through existing procedures specified in the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure for formal and expedited relief.

General Monitoring Procedures

Mitigation Monitor

Many of the monitoring procedures will be conducted during the construction phase of the Project. The CPUC and the mitigation monitor are responsible for integrating the mitigation monitoring procedures into the construction process in coordination with SCE. To oversee the monitoring procedures and to ensure success, the mitigation monitor assigned to the construction must be on site during that portion of construction that has the potential to create a significant environmental impact or other impact for which mitigation is required. The mitigation monitor is responsible for ensuring that all procedures specified in the monitoring program are followed.

Construction Personnel

A key feature contributing to the success of mitigation monitoring will be obtaining the full cooperation of construction personnel and supervisors. Many of the mitigation measures require action on the part of the construction supervisors or crews for successful implementation. To ensure success, the following actions, detailed in specific mitigation measures included in the MMRCP, will be taken:

- Procedures to be followed by construction companies hired to do the work will be written into contracts between SCE and any construction contractors. Procedures to be followed by construction crews will be written into a separate agreement that all construction personnel will be asked to sign, denoting agreement.

- One or more pre-construction meetings will be held to inform all and train construction personnel about the requirements of the MMRCP.

- A written summary of mitigation monitoring procedures will be provided to construction supervisors for all mitigation measures requiring their attention.

General Reporting Procedures

Site visits and specified monitoring procedures performed by other individuals will be reported to the mitigation monitor assigned to the construction. A monitoring record form will be submitted to the mitigation monitor by the individual conducting the visit or procedure so that details of the visit can be recorded and progress tracked by the mitigation monitor. A checklist will be developed and maintained by the mitigation monitor to track all procedures required for each mitigation measure and to ensure that the timing specified for the procedures is adhered to. The mitigation monitor will note any problems that may occur and take appropriate action to rectify the problems. SCE shall provide the CPUC with written quarterly reports of the Project, which shall include progress of construction, resulting impacts, mitigation implemented, and all other noteworthy elements of the Project. Quarterly reports shall be required as long as mitigation measures are applicable.

Public Access to Records

The public is allowed access to records and reports used to track the monitoring program. Monitoring records and reports will be made available for public inspection by the CPUC on request. The CPUC and SCE will develop a filing and tracking system.

Condition Effectiveness Review

In order to fulfill its statutory mandates to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment and to design a MMRCP to ensure compliance during Project implementation (CEQA Guidelines §21081.6):

- The CPUC may conduct a comprehensive review of conditions which are not effectively mitigating impacts at any time it deems appropriate, including as a result of the Dispute Resolution procedure outlined above; and

- If in either review, the CPUC determines that any conditions are not adequately mitigating significant environmental impacts caused by the project, or that recent proven technological advances could provide more effective mitigation, then the CPUC may impose additional reasonable conditions to effectively mitigate these impacts.

These reviews will be conducted in a manner consistent with the CPUC's rules and practices.

Mitigation Monitoring, Reporting, and Compliance Program

The table attached to this program presents a compilation of the mitigation measures in the EIR. The purpose of the table is to provide a single comprehensive list of impacts, mitigation measures, monitoring and reporting requirements, and timing.

SCE proposed the following APMs to minimize impacts on biological and paleontological resources from Project implementation. The impact analysis in this EIR assumed that these APMs would be implemented as part of the Project.

APM-BIO-01 Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) and Nesting Raptors: In order to avoid impacts on nesting birds and raptors (common or special status), Project initiation shall be scheduled outside the breeding season (i.e., March 15–September 15 for nesting birds; February 1–June 30 for nesting raptors). If Project timing requires that work be initiated during this time period, a pre-construction survey shall be conducted by a qualified Biologist for nesting birds and/or raptors within 7 days prior to clearing of any vegetation or any work within 500 feet of construction areas. If the Biologist does not find any active nests within the impact area, the vegetation clearing/construction work shall be allowed to proceed.

If the Biologist finds an active nest within the construction area and determines that the nest may be impacted or breeding activities substantially disrupted, the Biologist will delineate an appropriate buffer zone around the nest depending on the sensitivity of the species and the nature of the construction activity. The active site will be protected until nesting activity has ended to ensure compliance with the MBTA and California Fish and Game Code. Encroachment into the buffer area

around a known nest shall only be allowed if the Biologist determines that the proposed activity would not disturb the nest occupants.

APM-BIO-02 Riversidean Alluvial Fan Sage Scrub, Disturbed Riversidean Alluvial Fan Sage Scrub, Disturbed Riversidean Sage Scrub, and Annual Grassland/Disturbed Riversidean Alluvial Fan Sage Scrub: Project impacts on sage scrub vegetation types would be avoided and/or minimized to the maximum extent practicable. Permanent impacts to disturbed Riversidean alluvial fan sage scrub, disturbed Riversidean sage scrub, and annual grassland/disturbed Riversidean alluvial fan sage scrub vegetation would be mitigated at a minimum replacement ratio of 1:1. Residual temporary impacts on undisturbed/disturbed Riversidean alluvial fan sage scrub would be restored on site and/or mitigated at a replacement ratio of 1:1. Permanent impacts on undisturbed Riversidean alluvial fan sage scrub would be mitigated at a replacement ratio of up to 3:1. Final compensation ratios for impacts to Riversidean alluvial fan sage scrub would be determined in consultation with USFWS and CDFG.

A detailed restoration program shall be prepared for approval by SCE and the appropriate resource agencies. Restoration shall consist of seeding and planting containers of appropriate Riversidean alluvial fan sage scrub species. The program shall include, at a minimum, the following items:

- Responsibilities and qualifications of the personnel to implement and supervise the plan.
- Site selection.
- Site preparation and planting implementation.
- Schedule.
- Maintenance plan/guidelines.
- Monitoring plan.
- Long-term preservation.

Additionally, the grading limits shall be clearly marked, and temporary fencing or other appropriate markers shall be placed around any sage scrub vegetation adjacent to work areas prior to the commencement of any ground-disturbing activity or native vegetation removal. No construction access, parking, or storage of equipment or materials shall be allowed within the marked areas. SCE shall be fully responsible for implementing the Riversidean Alluvial Fan Sage Scrub Revegetation Program until the restoration areas have met the success criteria outlined in the program. SCE and the appropriate resource agencies shall have final authority over mitigation area sign-off. The site shall be monitored and maintained for a suitable number of years to ensure successful establishment of Riversidean alluvial fan sage scrub habitat within the restored and created areas, as determined by the resource agencies.

In lieu of developing an offsite restoration program for permanent impacts to Riversidean alluvial fan sage scrub, disturbed Riversidean alluvial fan sage scrub, disturbed Riversidean sage scrub and annual grassland/disturbed Riversidean alluvial fan sage scrub, SCE would pay mitigation fees to a local conservation bank that would advance regional environmental objectives by restoring or purchasing contiguous habitat whose natural resource values, species composition and habitat types present are comparable to impacted habitat at the proposed Project site. For example, SCE has identified the Cajon Creek Conservation Bank as a suitable, local conservation bank to meet mitigation objectives under the guidance of the appropriate resource agencies.

APM-PA-01 Develop and Implement a Paleontological Monitoring Plan: A project paleontologist meeting the qualifications established by the Society of Vertebrate Paleontologists shall be retained by SCE to develop and implement a Paleontological Monitoring Plan prior to the start of ground disturbing activities for the Project. As part of the Paleontological Monitoring Plan, the project paleontologist shall establish a curation agreement with an accredited facility prior to the initiation of ground-disturbing activities. The Paleontological Monitoring Plan shall also include a final monitoring report. If fossils are identified, the final monitoring report shall contain an appropriate description of the fossils, treatment, and curation.

APM-PA-02 Paleontological Monitoring for the Project: A paleontological monitor shall be on site to spot check ground-disturbing activities at depths greater than 5 feet during installation of the Project. If very few or no fossils remains are found during ground disturbing activities monitoring time can be reduced or suspended entirely as per recommendations of the paleontological field supervisor. If fossils are found during ground disturbing activities, the paleontological monitor shall halt the ground-disturbing activities within 25 feet of the find in order to allow evaluation of the find and determination of appropriate treatment.

TABLE H-1
MITIGATION MONITORING, REPORTING AND COMPLIANCE PROGRAM FOR THE FALCON RIDGE SUBSTATION PROJECT

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures Proposed in this EIR	Implementing Actions	Monitoring/Reporting Requirements	Timing
Aesthetics				
Impact 4.1-1: The Project would have an adverse effect on a scenic vista.	**Mitigation Measure 4.1-1:** SCE and/or its contractors shall use subtransmission line conductors that are non-specular and non-reflective and insulators that are non-reflective and non-refractive.	SCE and its contractors to implement measure as defined.	SCE to incorporate measures into final design plans. SCE to submit final design plans to the CPUC.	At least 30 days prior to commencement of construction activities.
Impact 4.1-3: Use of construction conductor/wire stringing set-up locations during the approximately 12-month construction period could result in temporary adverse impacts to visual quality.	**Mitigation Measure 4.1-3:** SCE and/or its contractors shall not place equipment at the conductor/wire stringing set-up locations more than 2 weeks prior to the required use.	SCE and its contractors to implement measure as defined.	CPUC mitigation monitor to monitor compliance.	During all phases of construction activities.
Impact 4.1-6: The Project would introduce new sources of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.	**Mitigation Measure 4.1-6:** Implement Mitigation Measure 4.1-1.	See Mitigation Measure 4.1-1.	See Mitigation Measure 4.1-1.	See Mitigation Measure 4.1-1.
Agriculture and Forestry Resources				
No Impact	None Required	--	--	--
Air Quality				
Impact 4.3-1: Project construction activities would generate NO_x and PM10 emissions that could contribute substantially to violations of ozone and PM10 air quality standards.	**Mitigation Measure 4.3-1a:** For diesel-fueled off-road construction equipment of more than 50 horsepower, SCE shall make a good faith effort to use available construction equipment that meets the highest USEPA-certified tiered emission standards. An Exhaust Emissions Control Plan that indentifies each unit's certified tier specification, Best Available Control Technology (BACT), and the CARB or SCAQMD operating permit number (if applicable) shall be submitted to the CPUC for review and approval at least 30 days prior to commencement of construction activities. Construction activities cannot commence until the plan has been approved. For all pieces of equipment that would not meet Tier 3 emission standards, the Exhaust Emissions Control Plan shall include documentation from two local heavy construction equipment rental companies that	SCE and its contractors to implement measure as defined.	SCE to submit a copy of the Exhaust Emissions Control Plan to CPUC for review.	At least 30 days prior to commencement of construction activities.

TABLE H-1 (continued)
MITIGATION MONITORING, REPORTING AND COMPLIANCE PROGRAM FOR THE FALCON RIDGE SUBSTATION PROJECT

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures Proposed in this EIR	Implementing Actions	Monitoring/Reporting Requirements	Timing
Air Quality (cont.)				
Impact 4.3-1 (cont.)	indicates that the companies do not have access to higher tiered equipment for the given class of equipment.			
	Mitigation Measure 4.3-1b: SCE and/or its contractors shall develop a Fugitive Dust Control Plan that specifically describes how compliance with each of SCAQMD Rule 403 Best Available Control Measures (BACMs) shall be achieved. If it is determined that any of the BACMs are not applicable to construction of the Project, the plan shall present rationale as to why the BACMs are not applicable and would not be implemented. This plan shall be submitted to the CPUC for review and approval at least 30 days prior to commencement of construction activities, and the approved plan shall be distributed to all employees and construction contractors working on the Project.	SCE and its contractors to implement measure as defined.	SCE to submit a copy of the Fugitive Dust Control Plan to CPUC.	Submit plan to CPUC at least 30 days prior to commencement of construction activities.
Impact 4.3-3: Construction activities would generate emissions of criteria pollutants that would be cumulatively considerable.	**Mitigation Measure 4.3-3:** Implement Mitigation Measures 4.3-1a (Exhaust Emissions Control Plan) and 4.3-1b (Fugitive Dust Control Plan).	See Mitigation Measures 4.3-1a and 1b.	See Mitigation Measures 4.3-1a and 1b.	See Mitigation Measures 4.3-1a and 1b.
Biological Resources				
Impact 4.4-1: Construction activities could result in adverse impacts to special-status plant species.	**Mitigation Measure 4.4-1:** Where avoidance of Riversidean sage scrub habitat is not possible, SCE shall compensate for losses through habitat creation and enhancement, and long-term preservation for temporary and permanent impacts by implementing the following measures: • SCE shall establish buffer zones and mitigate for the loss of special-status plant species and sensitive plant communities. SCE and their contractors shall avoid and minimize impacts to special-status plant species and sensitive plant communities to the maximum extent feasible. Avoidance will be carried out by establishing a visible buffer zone around sensitive areas prior to construction in coordination with a qualified biologist, redesigning or relocating proposed disturbance areas, locating staging areas within	SCE and its contractors to implement measure as defined.	SCE to incorporate measures into final design plans. CPUC mitigation monitor to monitor compliance.	Submit final design plans to CPUC at least 30 days prior to commencement of construction activities. During all phases of construction activities.

TABLE H-1 (continued)
MITIGATION MONITORING, REPORTING AND COMPLIANCE PROGRAM FOR THE FALCON RIDGE SUBSTATION PROJECT

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures Proposed in this EIR	Implementing Actions	Monitoring/Reporting Requirements	Timing
Biological Resources (cont.)				
Impact 4.4-1 (cont.)	disturbed areas when possible, or using other measures recommended by the CNPS (1998). • SCE shall mitigate for Riversidean sage scrub vegetation losses at a minimum replacement ratio of 1:1. Residual temporary impacts on disturbed mule fat scrub and undisturbed/disturbed Riversidean sage scrub shall be restored on site and/or mitigated at a replacement ratio of 1:1. Permanent impacts on undisturbed Riversidean sage scrub shall be mitigated at a replacement ratio of up to 3:1. Final compensation ratios for impacts to Riversidean sage scrub shall be determined in consultation with the USFWS and CDFG. • As a component of the Program, SCE shall develop and implement a five-year restoration mitigation and monitoring program. The Program will be described in a Restoration Plan that shall be subject to approval by the USFWS, CDFG, and the CPUC. The Restoration Plan shall include: – detailed design drawings and specifications for the mitigation site(s), including site drawings, final grade elevations, an appropriately spaced planting plan, a plant species list showing the number of each plant species, and notes on proper site preparation (including temporary erosion and sediment control); – a discussion of ongoing maintenance practices to protect the mitigation site, including a minimum 5-year performance monitoring program with specific, measurable performance standards to evaluate mitigation success; – a contingency plan indicating actions and corrective measures to be taken if monitoring indicates performance standards are not being met; – a statement of financial assurance that the mitigation will be constructed, maintained, monitored, and contingencies implemented, if necessary; and – a plan for restoring temporarily disturbed areas.			

TABLE H-1 (continued)
MITIGATION MONITORING, REPORTING AND COMPLIANCE PROGRAM FOR THE FALCON RIDGE SUBSTATION PROJECT

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures Proposed in this EIR	Implementing Actions	Monitoring/Reporting Requirements	Timing
Biological Resources (cont.)				
Impact 4.4-1 (cont.)	• SCE shall submit an annual vegetation monitoring report to the USFWS, CDFG, CPUC to document site compliance, advise of remedial actions that were undertaken during the previous monitoring year, and advise of restoration site management needs for the coming year. Reports shall be required for a minimum of five years following initial site restoration to document progress of mitigation areas toward attaining the minimum performance standards. • SCE shall revegetate all natural areas temporarily disturbed by project activities. Revegetation criteria will include general restoration concepts and methods, including the use of locally native plants, protection and restoration of soil conditions, and control of aggressive non-native plant species. The planting effort shall commence in the fall following completion of construction at a given site. If the project is expected to have an extended construction timeline, revegetation shall be completed as extensively as possible during each fall season. Interim revegetation by hydroseeding or with a seeding mixture and mulch using broadcast methods shall be implemented as necessary to control erosion in disturbed areas prior to final revegetation. The plant palette will include locally native plants such as California buckwheat, black sage, white sage, cane cholla, and California sagebrush. As an alternative to developing an off-site restoration program for permanent impacts to Riversidean alluvial fan sage scrub, disturbed Riversidean alluvial fan sage scrub, disturbed Riversidean sage scrub, and annual grassland/disturbed Riversidean alluvial fan sage scrub, SCE shall purchase mitigation credits from the Cajon Creek Conservation Bank, which is a CDFG-approved conservation and mitigation bank with the capacity to accommodate the project's mitigation requirements.			

TABLE H-1 (continued)
MITIGATION MONITORING, REPORTING AND COMPLIANCE PROGRAM FOR THE FALCON RIDGE SUBSTATION PROJECT

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures Proposed in this EIR	Implementing Actions	Monitoring/Reporting Requirements	Timing
Biological Resources (cont.)				
Impact 4.4-2: Construction activities associated with the Project could result in adverse impacts to Los Angeles pocket mouse and other non-listed special-status wildlife species.	**Mitigation Measure 4.4-2:** SCE and/or its contractors shall avoid impacts to occupied Los Angeles pocket mouse habitat to the maximum extent feasible in the final Project design. SCE shall define Los Angeles pocket mouse habitat as "off limits" in construction plans and specifications. If complete avoidance is not feasible, mitigation measures shall be implemented to reduce potential project impacts within occupied habitat to the maximum extent feasible. Such measures could include minimizing that portion of the project footprint that could encroach on an occupied habitat area and staging materials and work so as not to encroach into such an area. The presence of a Biological Monitor during Project construction shall be required to further ensure that any potential impacts to special-status wildlife species are avoided and minimized. For those impacts that cannot feasibly be avoided or further minimized, SCE shall purchase mitigation credits from the Cajon Creek Conservation Bank, which is a CDFG-approved conservation and mitigation bank with the capacity to accommodate the project's mitigation requirements.	SCE and its contractors to implement measure as defined.	CPUC mitigation monitor to monitor compliance.	During all phases of construction activities.
Impact 4.4-4: Operation of new transmission lines could impact raptors as a result of electrocution or collision.	**Mitigation Measure 4.4-4:** SCE shall follow Avian Power Line Interaction Committee guidelines for avian protection on powerlines. SCE shall use current guidelines to reduce bird mortality from interactions with powerlines. The Avian Power Line Interaction Committee (APLIC, 2006) and USFWS recommend the following: • Provide 60-inch minimum horizontal separation between energized conductors or energized conductors and grounded hardware; • Insulate hardware or conductors against simultaneous contact if adequate spacing is not possible; and • Use pole designs that minimize impacts to birds.	SCE and its contractors to implement measure as defined.	SCE to incorporate measures into final design plans.	Submit final design plans to CPUC at least 30 days prior to commencement of construction activities.

TABLE H-1 (continued)
MITIGATION MONITORING, REPORTING AND COMPLIANCE PROGRAM FOR THE FALCON RIDGE SUBSTATION PROJECT

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures Proposed in this EIR	Implementing Actions	Monitoring/Reporting Requirements	Timing
Biological Resources (cont.)				
Impact 4.4-6: Construction within the existing Etiwanda Substation could impact federally protected wetlands.	**Mitigation Measure 4.4-6a:** SCE shall through Project design, avoid jurisdictional waters of the U.S. and waters of the state where feasible. This includes minimizing the footprint of facilities at the existing Etiwanda Substation that could impact jurisdictional areas and spanning drainages that occur in the Project area.	SCE and its contractors to implement measure as defined.	SCE to incorporate measures into final design plans. CPUC mitigation monitor to monitor compliance.	Submit final design plans to CPUC at least 30 days prior to commencement of construction activities. During all phases of construction activities.
	Mitigation Measure 4.4-6b: In the event of any Project changes that involve ground disturbance outside the boundary of the Jurisdictional Delineation Report (BonTerra, 2010e), a new wetland delineation shall be performed.	SCE and its contractors to implement measure as defined.	SCE to incorporate measures into final design plans. CPUC mitigation monitor to monitor compliance.	Submit final design plans to CPUC at least 30 days prior to commencement of construction activities. During all phases of construction activities.
	Mitigation Measure 4.4-6c: Where jurisdictional wetlands and other waters cannot be avoided at the Etiwanda Substation, to offset anticipated temporary impacts that would occur as a result of the Project, the original contours and character of disturbed jurisdictional areas shall be restored. A minimum replacement ratio of 1:1, or as otherwise agreed to by the resource agencies, would be required to ensure that there would be no net loss of habitat value. Disturbed portions of jurisdictional areas shall be reseeded with an appropriate mix of native species that are appropriate to the site to prevent locally abundant non-native plants such as cocklebur from colonizing disturbed areas.	SCE and its contractors to implement measure as defined.	CPUC mitigation monitor to monitor compliance.	During all phases of construction activities.
Impact Alternative 15-BIO-1: Construction activities associated with the Project could result in adverse impacts to San Bernardino kangaroo rat.	**Mitigation Measure Alternative 15-BIO-1:** A habitat assessment for San Bernardino kangaroo rat shall be conducted by a qualified biologist within the Flood Control District ROW Alternative if this route is approved. If no potential occupied habitat is found during this assessment, then no further action would be necessary. If potential or occupied habitat is identified, USFWS protocol-level trapping surveys shall be performed. Based on survey findings, two potential outcomes are possible:	SCE and its contractors to implement measure as defined.	CPUC mitigation monitor to monitor compliance.	During all phases of construction activities, if Alternative 15 is selected.

TABLE H-1 (continued)
MITIGATION MONITORING, REPORTING AND COMPLIANCE PROGRAM FOR THE FALCON RIDGE SUBSTATION PROJECT

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures Proposed in this EIR	Implementing Actions	Monitoring/Reporting Requirements	Timing
Biological Resources (cont.)				
Impact Alternative 15-BIO-1 (cont.)	• If San Bernardino kangaroo rats are not identified during trapping, no impact would occur and no further action would be required. • If San Bernardino kangaroo rats are detected during surveys, an alternate alignment could be selected or the route altered to completely avoid all potential or occupied habitat for this species. If complete avoidance is not feasible, minimization measures shall be implemented to reduce potential project impacts within occupied habitat to the maximum extent feasible. Such measures could include minimizing that portion of the project footprint that could encroach on an occupied habitat area, surveying and establishing exclusionary perimeter fencing around such areas, and staging materials and work so as not to encroach into them. The presence of a Biological Monitor during Project construction shall be required to further ensure that any potential impacts to special-status wildlife species are avoided and minimized. For those impacts that cannot feasibly be avoided or further minimized, SCE shall purchase mitigation credits from the Cajon Creek Conservation Bank, which is a CDFG-approved conservation and mitigation bank with the capacity to accommodate the project's mitigation requirements.			
Impact Alternative 15-BIO-2: Construction activities could result in adverse impacts to special-status plant species.	**Mitigation Measure Alternative 15-BIO-2:** If the Flood Control District ROW Alternative is selected, portions of the proposed alignment that have not been surveyed to determine the potential presence or absence of special-status plants shall be surveyed following the most recent CDFG rare plant survey protocol (CDFG, 2009). Following surveys, two potential outcomes are possible: • If special-status plants are not identified during focused surveys, impacts would not be anticipated and no further action would be required. • If special-status plants are identified during surveys, the implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.4-1 would reduce potential impacts to a less-than-significant level.	SCE and its contractors to implement measure as defined.	SCE to incorporate measures into final design plans. CPUC mitigation monitor to monitor compliance.	If Alternative 15 is selected, submit final design plans to CPUC at least 30 days prior to commencement of construction activities. During all phases of construction activities.

TABLE H-1 (continued)
MITIGATION MONITORING, REPORTING AND COMPLIANCE PROGRAM FOR THE FALCON RIDGE SUBSTATION PROJECT

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures Proposed in this EIR	Implementing Actions	Monitoring/Reporting Requirements	Timing
Biological Resources (cont.)				
Impact Staging Area-BIO-1: Construction activities could result in adverse impacts to special-status plant species.	**Mitigation Measure Staging Area-BIO-1:** Potential Staging Area No. 8 shall be surveyed prior to the commencement of any activities that may modify vegetation, such as clearing or ground-breaking activities, following the most recent CDFG rare plant survey protocol (CDFG, 2009). Following surveys, two potential outcomes are possible: • If special-status plants are not identified during focused surveys or surveys indicate that special-status plant habitat does not occur on-site, impacts would not be anticipated and no further action would be required. • If special-status plants are identified during surveys, compensation for the losses shall be required by implementing Mitigation Measure 4.4-1, which would result in habitat creation and enhancement, and long-term preservation for temporary and permanent impacts.	SCE and its contractors to implement measure as defined.	SCE to incorporate measures into final design plans. CPUC mitigation monitor to monitor compliance.	If Staging Area No. 8 is selected, submit final design plans to CPUC at least 30 days prior to commencement of construction activities. During all phases of construction activities.
Impact Intex Alternative-BIO-1: Construction activities associated with the Project could result in adverse impacts to San Bernardino kangaroo rat.	**Mitigation Measure Intex Alternative -BIO-1:** A habitat assessment for San Bernardino kangaroo rat shall be conducted by a qualified biologist within the Intex Alternative if this route is approved. If no potential occupied habitat is found during this assessment, then no further action would be necessary. If potential or occupied habitat is identified, USFWS protocol-level trapping surveys shall be performed. Based on survey findings, two potential outcomes are possible: • If San Bernardino kangaroo rats are not identified during trapping, no impact would occur and no further action would be required. • If San Bernardino kangaroo rats are detected during surveys, an alternate alignment could be selected or the route altered to completely avoid all potential or occupied habitat for this species. If complete avoidance is not feasible, minimization measures shall be implemented to reduce potential project impacts within occupied habitat to the maximum	SCE and its contractors to implement measure as defined.	CPUC mitigation monitor to monitor compliance.	During all phases of construction activities, if the Intex Alternative is selected.

TABLE H-1 (continued)
MITIGATION MONITORING, REPORTING AND COMPLIANCE PROGRAM FOR THE FALCON RIDGE SUBSTATION PROJECT

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures Proposed in this EIR	Implementing Actions	Monitoring/Reporting Requirements	Timing
Biological Resources (cont.)				
Impact Intex Alternative-BIO-1 (cont.)	extent feasible. Such measures could include minimizing that portion of the project footprint that could encroach on an occupied habitat area, surveying and establishing exclusionary perimeter fencing around such areas, and staging materials and work so as not to encroach into them. The presence of a Biological Monitor during Project construction shall be required to further ensure that any potential impacts to special-status wildlife species are avoided and minimized. For those impacts that cannot feasibly be avoided or further minimized, SCE shall purchase mitigation credits from the Cajon Creek Conservation Bank, which is a CDFG-approved conservation and mitigation bank with the capacity to accommodate the project's mitigation requirements.			
Impact Intex Alternative-BIO-2: Construction activities could result in adverse impacts to special-status plant species.	**Mitigation Measure Intex Alternative -BIO-2:** If the Intex Alternative is selected, portions of the proposed alignment that have not been surveyed to determine the potential presence or absence of special-status plants shall be surveyed following the most recent CDFG rare plant survey protocol (CDFG, 2009). Following surveys, two potential outcomes are possible: • If special-status plants are not identified during focused surveys, impacts would not be anticipated and no further action would be required. • If special-status plants are identified during surveys, the implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.4-1 would reduce potential impacts to a less-than-significant level.	SCE and its contractors to implement measure as defined.	SCE to incorporate measures into final design plans. CPUC mitigation monitor to monitor compliance.	If the Intex Alternative is selected, submit final design plans to CPUC at least 30 days prior to commencement of construction activities. During all phases of construction activities.

TABLE H-1 (continued)
MITIGATION MONITORING, REPORTING AND COMPLIANCE PROGRAM FOR THE FALCON RIDGE SUBSTATION PROJECT

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures Proposed in this EIR	Implementing Actions	Monitoring/Reporting Requirements	Timing
Cultural Resources				
Impact 4.5-1: Project construction could cause an adverse change in the significance of a historical resource [inclusive of archaeological resources] which is either listed or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places, the California Register of Historical Resources, or a local register of historic resources; or to a unique archaeological resource.	**Mitigation Measure 4.5-1:** Cease Work if Subsurface Archaeological Resources are Discovered During Ground-Disturbing Activities. If archaeological resources are encountered during Project-related activity, SCE and/or its contractors shall cease all activity within 100 feet of the find until the find can be evaluated by a qualified archaeologist. If the archaeologist determines that the resources are significant, the archaeologist shall notify the CPUC and the resource shall be avoided if feasible. If avoidance is infeasible, a Treatment Plan that documents the research approach and methods for data recovery shall be prepared and implemented in consultation with CPUC and with appropriate Native American representatives (if the resources are prehistoric or Native American in nature). Work may proceed on other parts of the Project area while treatment is being carried out.	SCE and its contractors to implement measure as defined.	SCE to submit Historic Properties Treatment Plan to the CPUC staff for review.	Submit plan to CPUC at least 30 days prior to commencement of construction activities.
Impact 4.5-2: Project implementation would have a potentially significant impact on a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature.	**Mitigation Measure 4.5-2:** Prior to the initiation of any site preparation or start of construction, SCE and/or its contractors shall contract with a qualified vertebrate paleontologist, who shall be responsible for preparing and implementing a paleontological monitoring plan. The paleontologist must be a practicing scientist who is recognized in the paleontologic community, and is proficient in vertebrate paleontology, as demonstrated by institutional affiliations or appropriate credentials, ability to recognize and recover vertebrate fossils in the field, local geological and biostratigraphic expertise, and publications in scientific journals. The qualified paleontologist shall be available "on-call" to SCE and/or its contractors throughout the duration of ground-disturbing activities. At a minimum, the scope of services shall include: • Preparation of a paleontological monitoring plan based on final project design. The qualified professional paleontologist shall review information presented in this EIR, existing fossil localities in the region, Project grading plans and all geological/geotechnical reports developed to date to determine with greater precision the depth and extent of geologic units of high paleontological potential	SCE and its contractors to implement measure as defined.	SCE to submit paleontological monitoring plan to the CPUC staff for review. CPUC mitigation monitor to monitor compliance.	Submit plan to CPUC at least 30 days prior to commencement of construction activities. During all phases of construction activity.

TABLE H-1 (continued)
MITIGATION MONITORING, REPORTING AND COMPLIANCE PROGRAM FOR THE FALCON RIDGE SUBSTATION PROJECT

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures Proposed in this EIR	Implementing Actions	Monitoring/Reporting Requirements	Timing
Cultural Resources (cont.)				
Impact 4.5-2 (cont.)	(e.g. older alluvial fan deposits) within the areas to be excavated. Based on the volume, depth and extent of soil excavations and the professional judgment of the paleontologist, he or she shall prepare a paleontological monitoring plan describing the locations/phases of project construction activity where paleontological monitoring of ground-disturbing activities would be needed. The monitoring plan shall outline procedures to follow in the event of discovery of a potentially significant fossil resource and shall describe the assessment and salvage procedures to be followed. The report shall also identify a paleontological repository (i.e., a publicly supported, not-for-profit museum or university employing a permanent curator) that is willing and able to accept and curate any fossil specimens recovered from Project construction sites. Construction of the Project shall not proceed until the report has been reviewed and approved by the CPUC. • Active monitoring of construction sites for paleontological resources. During construction of the Project, paleontological monitoring will consist of periodically inspecting disturbed, graded, and excavated surfaces, as well as soil stockpiles and disposal sites, as identified in the paleontological monitoring plan. The monitor (which will be the professional paleontologist or a designee) will have authority to divert grading or excavation away from exposed surfaces temporarily in order to examine disturbed areas more closely, and/or recover fossils. The monitor will coordinate with the construction manager to ensure that monitoring is thorough but does not result in unnecessary delays. If the monitor encounters a paleontological resource, he or she shall assess the fossil, and record or salvage it, as described below. • Assessment and salvage of potential fossil finds. If potential fossils are discovered incidentally by construction crews, or in areas being actively monitored, all earthwork or other types of ground disturbance within 50 feet of the find shall stop			

TABLE H-1 (continued)
MITIGATION MONITORING, REPORTING AND COMPLIANCE PROGRAM FOR THE FALCON RIDGE SUBSTATION PROJECT

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures Proposed in this EIR	Implementing Actions	Monitoring/Reporting Requirements	Timing
Cultural Resources (cont.)				
Impact 4.5-2 (cont.)	immediately until the qualified professional paleontologist can assess the nature and importance of the find. Based on the scientific value or uniqueness of the find, the monitor may record the find and allow work to continue, or recommend salvage and recovery of the fossil. The monitor may also propose modifications to the stop-work radius based on the nature of the find, site geology, and the activities occurring on the site. If treatment and salvage is required, recommendations will be consistent with SVP guidelines (SVP, 1995; SVP, 1996) and currently accepted scientific practice, and shall be subject to review and approval by the CPUC. If required, treatment for fossil remains may include preparation and recovery of fossil materials so that they can be housed in the paleontological repository, and may also include preparation of a report for publication describing the finds. SCE and/or its contractors will be responsible for ensuring that treatment is implemented and reported to the CPUC. If no report is required, SCE and/or its contractors will nonetheless ensure that information on the nature, location, and depth of all finds is readily available to the scientific community through university curation or other appropriate means.			
Impact 4.5-3: Project construction could result in damage to previously unidentified human remains.	**Mitigation Measure 4.5-3:** If human remains are uncovered during Project construction, SCE and/or its contractors shall immediately halt all work in the immediate vicinity, and SCE's archaeologist or cultural resources consultant shall contact the county coroner to evaluate the remains and shall follow the procedures and protocols set forth in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5 (e)(1). If the county coroner determines that the remains are Native American, SCE and/or its contractors shall contact the NAHC, in accordance with Health and Safety Code §7050.5, subdivision (c), and Public Resources Code 5097.98 (as amended by AB 2641). Per Public Resources Code 5097.98, SCE shall ensure that the immediate vicinity, according to generally accepted cultural or archaeological standards or practices, where the Native American human	SCE and its contractors to implement measure as defined.	If human remains are discovered, SCE is to notify the CPUC and San Bernardino County coroner immediately.	During all phases of construction activities.

TABLE H-1 (continued)
MITIGATION MONITORING, REPORTING AND COMPLIANCE PROGRAM FOR THE FALCON RIDGE SUBSTATION PROJECT

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures Proposed in this EIR	Implementing Actions	Monitoring/Reporting Requirements	Timing
Cultural Resources (cont.)				
Impact 4.5-3 (cont.)	remains are located, is not damaged or disturbed by further development activity until the SCE archaeologist and/or its cultural resources contractor has discussed and conferred, as prescribed in this section (PRC 5097.98), with the most likely descendents regarding their recommendations, if applicable, taking into account the possibility of multiple human remains.			
Impact Alternative 1-CUL-1: Project construction could cause an adverse change in the significance of a historical resource [inclusive of archaeological resources] which is either listed or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places, the California Register of Historical Resources, or a local register of historic resources, or a unique archaeological resource.	**Mitigation Measure Alternative 1-CUL-1:** SCE and/or its contractors shall retain a qualified archaeologist (defined as an archaeologist meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for professional archaeology) to survey those portions of the final selected Project footprint that have not been previously subjected to systematic pedestrian cultural resources survey. After additional archaeological survey is carried out, the archaeologist shall prepare a report, for approval by the CPUC, that summarizes the survey efforts, and evaluates any identified cultural resources for their eligibility for listing in the National Register, California Register, or local register, or as a unique archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5. Any resources determined to be significant shall be avoided if feasible. If avoidance is infeasible, a Treatment Plan that documents the research approach and methods for data recovery shall be prepared and implemented in consultation with CPUC and with appropriate Native American representatives (if the resources are prehistoric or Native American in nature).	SCE and its contractors to implement measure as defined.	SCE to submit Archaeological Survey Report to CPUC for review. If needed, SCE to submit Treatment Plan to CPUC for review.	If Alternative 1 is selected, Complete survey and submit report and Treatment Plan (if needed) to the CPUC at least 30 days prior to commencement of construction activities.
Energy Conservation				
Less than Significant	None Required	--	--	--
Geology and Soils				
Less than Significant	None Required	--	--	--
Greenhouse Gas Emissions				
Less than Significant	None Required	--	--	--

TABLE H-1 (continued)
MITIGATION MONITORING, REPORTING AND COMPLIANCE PROGRAM FOR THE FALCON RIDGE SUBSTATION PROJECT

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures Proposed in this EIR	Implementing Actions	Monitoring/Reporting Requirements	Timing
Hazards and Hazardous Materials				
Impact 4.9-1: Project construction, operation and maintenance would require the use of certain materials such as fuels, oils, solvents, and other chemical products that could pose a potential hazard to the public or the environment during routine transport, use or disposal.	**Mitigation Measure 4.9-1:** SCE and/or its contractors shall prepare and implement a Health and Safety Plan in accordance with applicable regulations prior to construction. The health and safety plan shall identify the chemicals potentially present in soil, health and safety hazards associated with those chemicals, monitoring to be performed during site activities, soil handling methods required to minimize the potential for harmful exposures, appropriate personnel protective equipment, and emergency response procedures. The plan shall be submitted to the CPUC for approval prior to commencement of construction activities and shall be distributed to all construction crew members prior to construction and operation of the Project.	SCE and its contractors to implement measure as defined.	SCE to submit Health and Safety Plan to CPUC for review.	At least 30 days prior to commencement of construction activities.
Impact 4.9-5: The Project would reduce compliance with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.	**Mitigation Measure 4.9-5:** Implement Mitigation Measure 4.17-1.	See Mitigation Measure 4.17-1.	See Mitigation Measure 4.17-1.	See Mitigation Measure 4.17-1.
Impact 4.9-6: Construction, operation and maintenance-related activities in high fire hazard areas could ignite dry vegetation and start a fire.	**Mitigation Measure 4.9-6:** SCE and/or its contractors shall prepare and implement a Fire Prevention and Emergency Response Plan to ensure the health and safety of construction workers, SCE personnel, and the public during Project construction and operation. The Fire Prevention and Emergency Response Plan shall include, but not be limited to, the following: • Two water trucks each of 4,000-gallon capacity, equipped with 50 feet of fast-response hose with fog nozzles, shall be on-site during construction for immediate response to fire incidents, unless this provision is amended by the fire jurisdictions. • Each Project construction site (if construction occurs simultaneously at various locations) and the proposed Falcon Ridge substation shall be equipped with fire extinguishers and fire-fighting equipment sufficient to extinguish small fires.	SCE and its contractors to implement measure as defined.	SCE to submit Fire Prevention and Emergency Response Plan and evidence of consultation with SBCFD and local fire departments to CPUC for review.	At least 30 days prior to commencement of construction activities.

TABLE H-1 (continued)
MITIGATION MONITORING, REPORTING AND COMPLIANCE PROGRAM FOR THE FALCON RIDGE SUBSTATION PROJECT

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures Proposed in this EIR	Implementing Actions	Monitoring/Reporting Requirements	Timing
Hazards and Hazardous Materials (cont.)				
	• All construction workers and SCE personnel visiting the substation and/or subtransmission source lines to perform maintenance activities shall receive training on the proper use of fire-fighting equipment and procedures to be followed in the event of a fire. • The SBCFD and local fire departments shall be consulted during plan preparation and fire safety measures recommended by the agencies included. • The plan shall list fire prevention procedures and specific emergency response and evacuation measures that would be required to be followed during emergency situations. • The plan shall be submitted to the CPUC for approval prior to commencement of construction activities and shall be distributed to all construction crew members prior to construction and to all SCE personnel visiting the substation during operation and maintenance of the Project.			
Hydrology and Water Quality				
Less than Significant	None Required	--	--	--
Land Use				
Less than Significant	None Required	--	--	--
Mineral Resources				
Less than Significant	None Required	--	--	--

TABLE H-1 (continued)
MITIGATION MONITORING, REPORTING AND COMPLIANCE PROGRAM FOR THE FALCON RIDGE SUBSTATION PROJECT

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures Proposed in this EIR	Implementing Actions	Monitoring/Reporting Requirements	Timing
Noise				
Impact 4.13-1: Construction activities would violate City of Rancho Cucamonga exterior noise standards.	**Mitigation Measure 4.13-1:** SCE and/or its contractors shall develop a Construction Noise Reduction Plan in coordination with the City of Rancho Cucamonga to be implemented for construction activities within the City of Rancho Cucamonga. The Plan shall be submitted to the CPUC for review and approval prior to the commencement of construction activities. The Plan shall include, but not be limited to, the following measures for construction activities: • Publish and distribute to the potentially affected community within 200 feet, a telephone number, which shall be attended during active construction working hours, for use by the public to register complaints. All complaints shall be logged noting date, time, complainants' name, nature of complaint, and any corrective action taken. • All construction equipment shall have intake and exhaust mufflers recommended by the manufacturers thereof, to meet relevant noise limitations. • Maximize physical separation, as far as practicable, between noise sources (construction equipment) and noise receptors. Separation may be achieved by providing enclosures for stationary items of equipment and noise barriers around particularly noisy areas at the project sites and by locating stationary equipment to minimize noise impacts on the community. • Utilize construction noise barriers such as paneled noise shields, barriers, or enclosures adjacent to or around noisy equipment associated with construction activities, including access road construction, steel pole installation and wood pole removal, etc., in the immediate vicinity (i.e., within 200 feet) of sensitive receptors. Noise control shields shall be made featuring a solid panel and a weather-protected, sound-absorptive material on the construction-activity side of the noise shield. Shields used during linear construction activities shall be readily removable and moveable so that they may be repositioned, as necessary, to provide noise abatement for construction activities located near City of Rancho Cucamonga residential receptors.	SCE and its contractors to implement measure as defined.	SCE to submit Construction Noise Reduction Plan to CPUC for review and approval. CPUC mitigation monitor to monitor compliance.	At least 30 days prior to commencement of construction activities. During all phases of construction activities.

TABLE H-1 (continued)
MITIGATION MONITORING, REPORTING AND COMPLIANCE PROGRAM FOR THE FALCON RIDGE SUBSTATION PROJECT

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures Proposed in this EIR	Implementing Actions	Monitoring/Reporting Requirements	Timing
Noise (cont.)				
Impact 4.13-5: Construction-related noise levels would increase ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the Project.	**Mitigation Measure 4.13-5:** In the event that nighttime construction activity is determined to be necessary within 1,000 feet of sensitive receptors, SCE shall develop a Nighttime Noise and Nuisance Reduction Plan that shall be submitted to the CPUC for review and approval prior to the commencement of construction activities. The plan shall include a set of site-specific noise attenuation measures that apply state of the art noise reduction technology to ensure that nighttime construction noise levels and associated nuisances are reduced to the extent feasible. The attenuation measures may include, but not be limited to, the control strategies and methods for implementation that are listed below. If any of the following strategies are determined by SCE to not be feasible, an explanation as to why the specific strategy is not feasible shall be included in the Nighttime Noise and Nuisance Reduction Plan. • Plan construction activities to minimize the amount of nighttime construction. • Offer temporary relocation of residents within 200 feet of nighttime construction activities. • Temporary noise barriers, such as shields and blankets, shall be installed immediately adjacent to all nighttime stationary noise sources (e.g., auger rigs, bore rigs, generators, pumps, etc.). • Install temporary noise barriers that block the line of sight between nighttime activities and the closest residences within 1,000 feet. • Publish and distribute to the potentially affected community within 1,000 feet of pending nighttime construction activities, a telephone number, which shall be attended during nighttime construction working hours, for use by the public to register complaints. All complaints shall be logged noting date, time, complainants' name, nature of complaint, and any corrective action taken.	SCE and its contractors to implement measure as defined.	SCE to submit Construction Noise Reduction Plan to CPUC for review and approval. CPUC mitigation monitor to monitor compliance.	At least 30 days prior to commencement of construction activities. During all phases of construction activities.

TABLE H-1 (continued)
MITIGATION MONITORING, REPORTING AND COMPLIANCE PROGRAM FOR THE FALCON RIDGE SUBSTATION PROJECT

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures Proposed in this EIR	Implementing Actions	Monitoring/Reporting Requirements	Timing
Population and Housing				
Less than Significant	None Required	--	--	--
Public Services				
No Impact	None Required	--	--	--
Recreation				
Impact 4.16-1: The Project could increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facilities would occur or be accelerated.	**Mitigation Measure 4.16-1:** SCE shall coordinate with the City of Fontana Community Services Department to ensure that appropriate warning signs are posted alerting pedestrians and park users to pedestrian pathway and park closures and informing users about nearby alternative recreational resources, such as Koehler and North Fontana parks.	SCE and its contractors to implement measure as defined.	SCE to submit proposed warning signs to the CPUC for review. CPUC mitigation monitor to monitor compliance.	At least 15 days prior to commencement of construction activities. During all phases of construction activities.
Transportation and Traffic				
Impact 4.17-1: Project construction would cause temporary increases in traffic volumes on area roadways, and would temporarily reduce roadway capacity and increase traffic delays on area roadways or cause conflicts with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation.	**Mitigation Measure 4.17-1:** SCE and/or its contractor shall prepare and implement a traffic control plan to reduce construction related traffic impacts on the roadways at, and near the work site, as well as to reduce potential traffic safety hazards and ensure adequate access for emergency responders. SCE and/or its contractor shall coordinate development and implementation of this plan with jurisdictional agencies (e.g., San Bernardino County, Fontana, Rialto, Rancho Cucamonga, San Bernardino), as appropriate. To the extent applicable, the traffic control plan shall conform to Part 6 (Temporary Traffic Control) of the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (Caltrans, 2010), and shall include, but not be limited to, the following elements: • Circulation and detour plans to minimize impacts on local road circulation during road and lane closures. Flaggers and/or signage shall be used to guide vehicles through and/or around the construction zone.	SCE and its contractors to implement measure as defined.	SCE to submit Traffic Control Plan and evidence of coordination with local jurisdictions (encroachment permits, traffic control permits, etc.) to CPUC. CPUC mitigation monitor to monitor compliance.	At least 15 days prior to commencement of construction activities. During all phases of construction activities.

TABLE H-1 (continued)
MITIGATION MONITORING, REPORTING AND COMPLIANCE PROGRAM FOR THE FALCON RIDGE SUBSTATION PROJECT

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures Proposed in this EIR	Implementing Actions	Monitoring/Reporting Requirements	Timing
Transportation and Traffic (cont.)				
Impact 4.17-1 (cont.)	• Identifying truck routes designated by San Bernardino County and local jurisdictions. Haul routes that minimize truck traffic on local roadways shall be utilized to the extent possible. • Providing sufficient-sized staging areas for trucks accessing construction zones to minimize disruption of access to adjacent public right-of-ways. • Controlling and monitoring construction vehicle movement through the enforcement of standard construction specifications by on-site inspectors. • Scheduling truck trips outside the peak morning and evening commute hours to the extent possible. • Limiting the duration of road and lane closures to the extent possible. • Maintaining pedestrian and bicycle access and circulation during Project construction where safe to do so. If construction activities encroach on a bicycle routes or multi-use paths, advance warning signs (e.g., “Bicyclists Allowed Use of Full Lane” and/or “Share the Road”) shall be posted that indicate the presence of such users. • Identifying detours for bicycles and pedestrians, where applicable, in all areas where maintaining pedestrian and bicycle access and circulation during Project construction cannot be safely done. • Storing all equipment and materials in designated contractor staging areas on or adjacent to the worksite, such that traffic obstruction is minimized. • Implementing roadside safety protocols. Advance “Road Work Ahead” warning and speed control signs (including those informing drivers of state-legislated double fines for speed infractions in a construction zone) shall be posted to reduce speeds and provide safe traffic flow through the work zone. • Providing advance notification to administrators of police and fire stations (including fire protection agencies), ambulance service providers, and			

TABLE H-1 (continued)
MITIGATION MONITORING, REPORTING AND COMPLIANCE PROGRAM FOR THE FALCON RIDGE SUBSTATION PROJECT

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures Proposed in this EIR	Implementing Actions	Monitoring/Reporting Requirements	Timing
Transportation and Traffic (cont.)				
Impact 4.17-1 (cont.)	recreational facility managers of the timing, location, and duration of construction activities and the locations of detours and lane closures, where applicable. Maintain access for emergency vehicles within, and/or adjacent to, roadways affected by construction activities at all times. • Repairing and restoring affected roadway rights-of way to their original condition after construction is completed.			
Impact 4.17-4: The Project could substantially increase hazards due to a design feature or incompatible uses.	**Mitigation Measure 4.17-4:** Implement Mitigation Measure 4.17-1.	See Mitigation Measure 4.17-1.	See Mitigation Measure 4.17-1.	See Mitigation Measure 4.17-1.
Impact 4.17-5: Project construction could temporarily result in inadequate access to adjacent roadways and land uses for both general and emergency vehicles.	**Mitigation Measure 4.17-5:** Implement Mitigation Measure 4.17-1.	See Mitigation Measure 4.17-1.	See Mitigation Measure 4.17-1.	See Mitigation Measure 4.17-1.
Transportation and Traffic (cont.)				
Impact 4.17-6: The Project could conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities.	**Mitigation Measure 4.17-6:** Implement Mitigation Measure 4.17-1.	See Mitigation Measure 4.17-1.	See Mitigation Measure 4.17-1.	See Mitigation Measure 4.17-1.
Utilities and Service Systems				
Less than Significant	None Required	--	--	--

TABLE H-1 (continued)
MITIGATION MONITORING, REPORTING AND COMPLIANCE PROGRAM FOR THE FALCON RIDGE SUBSTATION PROJECT

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures Proposed in this EIR	Implementing Actions	Monitoring/Reporting Requirements	Timing
Cumulative Effects				
Impact CUMULATIVE-TRANS: The Project's contribution to traffic increases and safety hazards on local and regional roads could be cumulatively considerable.	**Mitigation Measure CUMULATIVE-TRANS: Coordinated Transportation Management Plan.** The Applicant and its construction management contractor(s) shall work with San Bernardino County and local jurisdictions (as appropriate) to prepare and implement a transportation management plan for roadways adjacent to and directly affected by the planned well facilities and pipeline alignments, and to address the transportation impact of the multiple overlapping construction projects within the vicinity of the projects in the region. The transportation management plan shall include, but not be limited to, the following requirements: • Coordination of individual traffic control plans for the Project and other projects. • Coordination between the contractor(s) and Applicant in developing circulation and detour plans that include safety features (e.g., signage and flaggers). The circulation and detour plans shall address: – Full and partial roadways closures – Circulation and detour plans to include the use of signage and flagging to guide vehicles through and/or around the construction zone, as well as any temporary traffic control devices – Bicycle and transit detour plans, where feasible – Parking along arterial and local roadways – Haul routes for construction trucks and staging areas for instances when multiple trucks arrive at the work sites – A public information outreach program to notify nearby residents and businesses in the area of construction activities • Establishment of protocols for updating the transportation management plan to account for delays or changes in the schedules of individual projects.	SCE and its contractors to implement measure as defined.	SCE to submit Coordinated Transportation Management Plan and evidence of coordination with local jurisdictions to CPUC. CPUC mitigation monitor to monitor compliance.	At least 15 days prior to commencement of construction activities. During all phases of construction activities.

(END OF APPENDIX 2)